

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11 and 13. The above Amendment shows all currently active claims in their current form for the Examiner's convenience.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification and drawings were objected to because of informalities. Claims 3 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 3-6, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Tobin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,945, hereinafter "the '945 patent"). Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '945 patent in view of Garlepp et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,103, hereinafter "the '103 patent"). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '945 patent in further view of Gervais et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,550,013, hereinafter "Gervais"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Gillingham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,503, hereinafter "the '503 patent"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '503 patent in view of the '945 patent, and Kametani (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,260, hereinafter "the '260 patent") and in further view of Kohno (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,013, hereinafter "Kohno"). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '503 patent, the '945 patent, the '260 patent and Gervais. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '503 patent, the '945, the '260 patent and further in view of the '103 patent. Claims 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the '503 patent in view of the

'945 patent and the '103 patent. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '503 patent, the '945 patent, and the '103 patent, and further in view of the '260 patent. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '503 patent in view of the '945 patent and the '103 patent in further view of Gervais.

In response to the objections to the drawings, Applicants have added the label "Conventional Art" to Figure 1 to comply with M.P.E.P. §608.02(g). In order to comply with the objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5), Applicants have amended the specification to include reference numerals 51 and 53 on page 5 of the specification. Further, Applicants have amended the specification to correct informalities regarding the word "resistor."

In response to the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a), Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 4 of the outstanding application clearly shows a multiplexer that transmits one of the column cycle signal and the read control signal to the gate of the second transistor. Thus, Applicants will maintain Figure 4 in its present form as Applicants believe that these features are shown. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with a joint effort to derive a mutually acceptable figure.

In response to the objection to claims 3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 13 to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, they have been amended to recite "the read control signal" activates the second transistor and the read control signal is sent by the controller.

In response to the objections to claims 3-6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 13, to make these claims definite. In response to the objection to claims 4, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants have

changed the word "control" to "controller" in claim 4 to comply with the Examiner's suggestions. If the Examiner disagrees with any of the above changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

In response to the objection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite "a controller including a multiplexer" to define over the '945 patent. Claim 1 also recites The '945 patent does not show a multiplexer in its configuration. Further, revised claim 3, is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art in view of their dependency to claim 1.

In response to the rejection of claims 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants have made analogous amendments to independent claim 11. In particular, claim 11 now recites a controller "including a multiplexer" to define over the cited prior art. Further, claim 13 has been amended in an analogous manner to claim 3. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-15 which depend from claim 11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art in view of the above amendment.

Now turning to the rejection of claim 7, claim 7 has been amended to recite that "a second transistor is connected to a controller including a multiplexer and is configured to selectively connect" to further define over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, and 8-10 which depend from claim 7, are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art because the cited prior art does not teach the amended configuration.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance for claims 1-15 is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encourage to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By



John A. Castellano
Reg. No. 35,094

JAC/TJM:jcp

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000